


Remarks

This communication responds to the Office Action mailed May 17, 2005 for the application captioned above. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 21-24, 27 and 30, rejected claims 1, 2, 4-12, 16-20, 25, 26, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), and rejected claims 13-15, 27-30 and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103. In light of the amendments above and the remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 27 and 30 as being identical. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's close review of the claims and has canceled claim 30 above.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 12, 17-20, 25, 26, and 31 under §102(b) as being anticipated by Hattori '621 (US 5,390,621). In light of the amendments above and the remarks that follow, Applicant respectfully disagrees and requests reconsideration.

With respect to independent claim 1, as amended above, Hattori '621 does not disclose the claimed generally V-shaped keel in which the keel has a has a central keel angle that is smaller at the rear limit than at the front limit where the front and rear limits are located within the middle third of the length of the bottom hull, as recited in claim 1. Instead, the hull section noted by the Examiner between lines AA and BB appears to lie in the front third of the Hattori '621 hull, as shown below. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the §102(b) rejection based on Hattori '621 of claim 1 (including any rejected, associated dependent claims) should be withdrawn.



Similarly, with respect to independent claim 31, Hattori '621 does not disclose a generally V-shaped center keel portion with a longitudinal keel section is located within the middle third of the hull over which concave areas on the sides of the keel portion get deeper toward the rear, as recited in claim 31. Again, the hull section noted by the Examiner between lines AA and BB appears to lie in the front third of the Hattori '621 hull, as shown above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the §102(b) rejection based on Hattori '621 of claim 31 (including any rejected, associated dependent claims) should be withdrawn.

With respect to independent claim 17, as amended above, Hattori '621 does not disclose a generally v-shaped keel over the middle third of the length of the hull. Instead, the middle third of the length of the Hattori '621 hull appears to be flat. Hattori '621 instead discloses "flat rear central portion 27." The middle third of the Hattori '621 hull containing flat central portion 27 is not generally V-shaped. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the §102(b) rejection based on Hattori '621 of claim 17 (including any rejected, associated dependent claims) should be withdrawn.

With respect to independent claim 26, as amended above, Hattori '621 does not disclose a central keel that is generally v-shaped along its entire length. As noted above in the discussion of claim 17, Hattori '621 discloses a "flat rear central portion 27." To the extent that portion 27 constitutes part of the keel, as argued by the Examiner on page 2 of the Action, then the keel of Hattori '621 is not generally v-shaped along its entire length. Accordingly, Applicant submits

that the §102(b) rejection based on Hattori '621 of claim 26 (including any rejected, associated dependent claims) should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 8-12 and 16 under §102(b) as being anticipated by Hattori '626 (US 5,255,626). In light of the remarks that follow, Applicant respectfully disagrees and requests reconsideration. As the Examiner notes on page 4 of the Action in his summary of Hattori '626, Hattori '626 includes "[a] center keel portion (54) [that] extends the length of the hull portion." Claim 8 recites "the keel portion terminating longitudinally forward of the water inlet." To the extent that "flat center part 54" constitutes a keel (which Applicant does not admit), this flat center part extends rearward of the water inlet 28 of Hattori '626 since it remains present in the cross-section shown in Fig. 6. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the §102(b) rejection based on Hattori '626 of claim 8 (including any rejected, associated dependent claims) should be withdrawn.

Figure 2





Figure 6



In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 27-30 and 32-34 under §103 as obvious in light of Hattori '621 and rejected claims 13-15 under §103 as obvious in light of Hattori '626. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Each of these claims (27-30, 32-34, and 13-15) depends directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims discussed above. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons Applicant presented why the §102(b) rejections based on Hattori

'621 or Hattori '626 should be withdrawn, Applicant submits the §103 rejections based on these same references of dependent claims 27-30, 32-34, and 13-15 should also be withdrawn.

Applicant believes no fee is due to enter the present Amendment. Applicant has canceled dependent claim 30 and added dependent claim 35, thereby keeping the same total number of claims presented. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional filing fees required to Deposit Account No. 061910. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 17, 2005



Charles D. Segelbaum
Reg. No. 42,138
(612) 492-7115

Customer No. 22859
Fredrikson & Byron, P.A.
200 South Sixth Street, Suite 4000
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1425 USA
Telephone: (612) 492-7000
Facsimile: (612) 492-7077

Please grant any extension of time necessary for entry; charge any fee due to Deposit Account No. 06-1910.

#3158381\1